

Dynamically Broken Scale Invariance and Cosmology

Shih-Yuin Lin*

Department of ElectroPhysics, Chiao Tung University, Hsin Chu, Taiwan 300, R.O.C.

Kin-Wang Ng†

Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan 115, R.O.C.

(September 1996)

A new scalar-tensor theory of gravity induced by dynamically broken scale invariance is proposed, and its cosmological implications are discussed. It is found that the model admits an inflation via the Hawking-Moss bubbling, but the inflation rate remains undetermined due to the strong gravity limit. In light of this, scale-invariant metric perturbations having a dominant tensor component can be generated without slow-rollover. In addition, the deviation from the standard hot big-bang is vanishingly small after inflation.

PACS numbers: 04.50.+h, 98.80.Cq

Einstein gravity (EG) agrees extremely well with experimental data. Nevertheless, it is not unreasonable to ponder other alternative or modified theories for gravity. Theoretically, the symmetry of general transformations of space-time coordinates, which dictates EG, is not guaranteed as the ultimate symmetry of space-time. Furthermore, while we believe that a theory of gravity should be a self-consistent quantum field theory, EG is not renormalizable [1]. On the cosmological side, we know that the big bang model, which is based on EG, has severe cosmological problems, despite its great success in modern cosmology. Although these problems can be circumvented by introducing an inflationary epoch in the early universe, a convincing microscopic origin for the slow-roll mechanism in new inflationary models is still lacking [2].

Among many modifications of EG, Brans-Dicke gravity (BDG) is the most popular one. Brans and Dicke, based on Mach's principle, introduced a scalar field $\hat{\phi}$ nonminimally coupled to the scalar curvature R , whose vacuum expectation value (vev) manifests as the effective gravitational constant G [3]. As a consequence, G is no longer a physical constant and may change with time. This leads to models of so-called induced gravity in which an effective potential $V(\hat{\phi})$ is added to account for the evolution of G [4]. Recently, BDG was applied as a new approach to inflationary cosmology, designated the extended inflation, which attempted to give the old inflation a graceful exit [5]. Later analyses showed that a successful extended inflation would require a non-trivial $V(\hat{\phi})$ or higher-order couplings of $\hat{\phi}$ to R [6], thus rendering the approach more or less artificial.

In this *Letter*, we propose a new scalar-tensor theory of gravitation, based on scale invariance of space-time. We begin with the action,

$$S_G = \int d^4x \sqrt{g} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \xi \hat{\phi}^2 R + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \hat{\phi}_{;\mu} \hat{\phi}_{;\nu} + \frac{\lambda}{4!} \hat{\phi}^4 \right], \quad (1)$$

for pure gravity, with signature $(-, +, +, +)$ and $\xi = 1/6$,

where the semicolons denote taking covariant derivative. The action is invariant under the scale transformations: $g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \Omega^2(x) g_{\mu\nu}$, and $\hat{\phi} \rightarrow \Omega^{-1}(x) \hat{\phi}$. This is in fact the Weyl gravity (WG) [7]. As is well known, WG is not physically acceptable because quantum phenomena provide an absolute standard of length. This can be resolved by either simply introducing a scale invariance breaking term such as a mass term for $\hat{\phi}$ [8] or supposing that the Einstein equations refer to an space-time interval connecting two neighbouring points which is not the same as the interval measured by atomic apparatus [9]. Here we will follow the former wisdom, but instead formulate a scheme for breaking the scale invariance dynamically. This requires finding the quantum corrections of the action S_G . Since S_G has a fixed value of ξ and a negative kinetic term for $\hat{\phi}$, it is generically different from BDG or induced gravity. The reader might worry that the model is tachyonic. As we will see below, a scrutiny shows that $\hat{\phi}$ is an auxiliary field and its one-loop effective potential can be well defined. As a consequence, the classical scalar field dynamics is similar to that in induced gravity, except that the kinetics of $\hat{\phi}$ contributes an effective negative stress-energy to the energy-momentum tensor. This peculiarity render the model a distinct feature that might shed a new light on understanding the inflation physics. Other issues, such as metric perturbations, varying gravitational constant, and the cosmological constant will also be briefly discussed.

If we were living in a pure-gravity space-time, the physical laws in it would be well described by WG. In fact, the pure WG (1) is equivalent to the EG plus a cosmological constant. This can be seen by simply choosing the Einstein gauge: $\hat{\phi}^2 = (3/4\pi) M_P^2$, where M_P is Planck mass. Thus, we can treat WG as a generalization of EG that admits space-time varying gravitational 'constant' and cosmological 'constant'. To prove this rigorously, we perturb the Lagrangian (1) around the ground-state background:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \phi^{-1} h_{\mu\nu}, \quad \hat{\phi} = \phi + \sigma, \quad (2)$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ is a flat space-time, and ϕ is a constant background field. Redefining $\rho_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + 2\sigma\eta_{\mu\nu}$, we find that the spectrum consists of a graviton $\rho_{\mu\nu}$ with a mass induced by the non-zero vacuum energy, as well as an auxiliary field σ that can be eliminated at the quadratic level. This spectrum has no difference from the EG's. We thus establish the first result: the Weyl scalar field, unlike Brans-Dicke's or other induced-gravity models', is a non-dynamical degree of freedom.

Now we evaluate the one-loop effective potential for ϕ by using the background field method [10]. After the expansion (2) up to terms quadratic in the quantum fields $h_{\mu\nu}$ and σ , we add the gauge fixing term,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gf}} = \frac{1}{2\alpha}(\partial^\mu h_{\mu\rho} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\rho h^\mu_\mu)^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta}(\partial_\mu \sigma)^2, \quad (3)$$

where α and β are arbitrary parameters. In the one-loop level, the ghost fields do not couple with other fields and thus can be neglected. Integrating out the quantum fields, we obtain the unrenormalized one-loop effective potential

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\lambda\phi^4}{4!} + 3\text{Tr}\ln\left(q^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\phi^2\right) + f(\alpha, \beta), \quad (4)$$

where q is a four-momentum, and the last term is gauge-choice dependent with $f(0, 0) = 0$. Henceforth, we choose the Laudau-DeWitt gauge, $\alpha = \beta = 0$ [11]. Then, the standard renormalization procedure [12] gives the renormalized effective potential,

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\kappa\lambda^2\phi^4}{64\pi^2}\left(2\ln\frac{\phi}{v} - \frac{1}{2}\right) + \Lambda, \quad (5)$$

where $\kappa = 3/2$ [13], and $v = \sqrt{3/4\pi}M_P$. Also, we have chosen the vev $\langle\phi\rangle = v$ and $\Lambda = \kappa\lambda^2v^4/(128\pi^2)$ such that $V(v) = 0$ and its first derivative $V'(v) = 0$. Apparently, this potential breaks the scale-invariance symmetry, and the vev determines the ground-state gravitational constant $G_N = 3/(4\pi v^2)$.

Since ϕ originates from the scaling of space-time, we do not expect that it couples directly to classical matter. Thus, we write down the action of the universe as $S_U = \tilde{S}_G + S_M$, where $\tilde{S}_G$ is the effective gravity action given by (1) except replacing the quartic potential with $V(\phi)$, and S_M is the action for classical matter. By varying S_U with respect to $g^{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ respectively, we obtain the field equations,

$$\frac{1}{6}\phi^2\left(R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}Rg^{\mu\nu}\right) = -\left(T_\phi^{\mu\nu} + T_M^{\mu\nu}\right), \quad (6)$$

$$T_\phi^{\mu\nu} = -\phi^{;\mu}\phi^{;\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\phi^{;\rho}\phi_{;\rho}g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{6}(\phi^2)^{;\rho}_{;\rho}g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{6}(\phi^2)^{;\mu;\nu} + g^{\mu\nu}V(\phi), \quad (7)$$

$$\phi^{;\mu}_{;\mu} + \frac{1}{6}\phi R - V'(\phi) = 0, \quad (8)$$

where $R^{\mu\nu}$ is the Ricci tensor, and $T_M^{\mu\nu}$ is the matter stress-energy defined by $2\delta S_M = \int d^4x \sqrt{g} T_M^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu}$. Note that $T_\phi^{\mu\nu}$ is negative. It can be shown from the field equations that

$$T_M^{\mu\nu}{}_{;\nu} = 0, \quad (9)$$

$$-g_{\mu\nu}T_M^{\mu\nu} = 4V(\phi) - \phi V'(\phi). \quad (10)$$

Let us assume Robertson-Walker space-time and a perfect-fluid form for matter:

$$d\tau^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t)\left[\frac{dr^2}{1-kr^2} + r^2 d\Omega^2\right], \quad (11)$$

$$T_M^{\mu\nu} = pg^{\mu\nu} + (\rho + p)U^\mu U^\nu, \quad (12)$$

where $a(t)$ is the cosmic scale factor, ρ and p are respectively the matter energy density and pressure, and U^μ is the four-velocity with $U^\mu U_\mu = -1$. Then, from the field equations and Eqs. (5), (9) and (10), we obtain the following evolution equations,

$$\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} + 2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\frac{\dot{\phi}}{\phi} = \frac{2}{\phi^2}\left[-\frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} - V(\phi) + \rho\right] - \frac{k}{a^2}, \quad (13)$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\phi} + \left(\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} + \frac{k}{a^2}\right)\phi + V'(\phi) = 0, \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{dp}{dt}a^3 = \frac{d}{dt}[a^3(\rho + p)], \quad (15)$$

$$\rho - 3p = 4V(\phi) - \phi V'(\phi) = 4\Lambda\left(1 - \frac{\phi^4}{v^4}\right), \quad (16)$$

where the dot represents time differentiation.

The evolution of ϕ is a damped motion in an effective potential $U(\phi) = -\phi^2 R/12 + V(\phi)$. $U(\phi)$ will have a maximum at ϕ_1 and a global minimum at ϕ_0 such that $\phi_1 < v/\sqrt{e} < \phi_0 < v$ if

$$-R < 3\kappa\lambda^2v^2/(16\pi^2e^{\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (17)$$

Suppose initially ϕ is located at the local minimum $\phi = 0$. Then, Eqs. (13) and (16) imply that $\rho = -p = \Lambda$. Usually, this equation of state signifies an exponential growth of a . But, in the strong gravitational coupling limit (i.e., $\phi \ll v$) such as here, $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is arbitrary. As the equation of state is homogeneous in space-time, we assume the metric be the maximally symmetric de Sitter space with $R = -12\bar{H}^2$, where $\bar{H}$ is a constant parameter only subject to the constraint (17). As such, ϕ will make a quantum tunneling through the barrier, $\Delta U = U(\phi_1) - U(0)$, via the Hawking-Moss (HM) homogeneous bubble solution [16–20]: the universe undergoes a quantum transition everywhere to $\phi = \phi_1$. It is interpreted as that the bubble nucleation occurs in a spatially homogeneous manner over a region of the order of the event horizon $\bar{H}^{-1}$, from which the whole of the presently observed universe would have developed [21]. This has been criticized by several authors [18]. However, our point of view is that

one cannot jump into any conclusion until the ambiguity of interpretation of the results of Euclidean approach to this tunneling problem has been clarified. (See also Ref. [20].) In the following, we will adopt HM's interpretation and explore the consequences to the present context. The tunneling probability per unit four-volume is of the order of $\bar{H}^4 e^{-B}$, where

$$B = \frac{8\pi^2}{3} \frac{\Delta U}{\bar{H}^4} = \frac{64\pi^4}{3\kappa\lambda^2} \ln^{-1} \frac{v}{\phi_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \ln^{-1} \frac{v}{\phi_1} \right). \quad (18)$$

Thus, a small λ would induce a huge tunneling action, and the causal region could easily inflate so large as to solve the cosmological problems.

After inflation, ϕ will roll quickly down the potential with critical damping towards ϕ_0 . During the radiation-dominated (RD) era, the trace condition (16) simply reads $\phi = v$. Thus, the evolution of the universe has no difference from the standard big-bang. In the matter-dominated (MD) epoch, the evolution equations can be rewritten as

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{2\bar{H}} \frac{\dot{G}}{G} \right)^2 = \Omega_M - \Omega_\phi, \quad (19)$$

$$1 - \frac{\phi^4}{v^4} = \frac{\rho_0}{4\Lambda} \left(\frac{a_0}{a} \right)^3, \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{\dot{G}}{G} = \frac{3}{2} \left(1 - \frac{v^4}{\phi^4} \right) H, \quad (21)$$

where the curvature term has been neglected, ρ_0 is the present energy density, and we have defined

$$G \equiv \frac{3}{4\pi\phi^2}, \quad \Omega_M \equiv \frac{8\pi G\rho}{3H^2}, \quad \Omega_\phi \equiv \frac{8\pi GV(\phi)}{3H^2}. \quad (22)$$

From this we deduce that the discrepancy from the standard big-bang is measured by the factor $\rho_0/\Lambda \simeq 10^{-118} \lambda^{-2} \Omega_{M0} h_0^2$, which would be almost a zero unless λ is fine-tuned. Below we will show that galaxy formation would require λ to be about 10^{-2} . Thus, after inflation G is practically equal to the gravitational constant G_N . Also, if we identify Ω_ϕ as the cosmological constant, then the latter would be almost vanishing.

Now we turn to estimate the metric perturbations generated during the HM bubble nucleation. For scalar perturbation, one needs to calculate the quantity $(\delta\rho)_k/(\rho+p)$ at the time the Fourier mode with wavenumber k crosses outside the horizon during inflation [22]. From the evolution equations, we find that $\rho+p \sim \dot{\phi}^2$ for $\phi < \phi_1$. On the other hand, the HM solution reflects the fact that the most probable quantum fluctuation will only just get over the potential barrier [21]. It means that the de Sitter thermal fluctuation of the field represented by $\dot{\phi}^2$ should be approximately equal to ΔU . (See also Ref. [23].) To find $(\delta\rho)_k$, we compute the spectral energy density of quanta produced during the transition of ϕ by solving the equation of motion for its fluctuation $\delta\phi(t, \vec{x})$,

$$\ddot{\delta\phi} + 3\bar{H}\dot{\delta\phi} + U''(\phi)\delta\phi - a^{-2}\nabla^2\delta\phi = 0. \quad (23)$$

We approximate the transition as a sudden process: $U''(\phi)$ is equal to $U''(0)$ and $U''(\phi_1)$ respectively before and after the transition. Following the standard Bogoliubov transformation [24], we find that after the transition the $(\delta\rho)_k$ at horizon crossing is approximately given by $\bar{H}^4$ for cosmologically interesting scales. Hence, when the mode crosses back inside the horizon during the MD era, the scalar perturbation is

$$\left. \frac{(\delta\rho)_k}{\rho} \right|_{\text{hor}} \sim \frac{\bar{H}^4}{\Delta U} = \frac{8\pi^2}{3B}. \quad (24)$$

This scale-invariant result is similar to that given in Ref. [23]. As is well known, in standard Einstein gravity the amplitude of tensor perturbation behaves as a massless, minimally coupled scalar field, and their Fourier modes are related by $h_k = \sqrt{16\pi G_N} \psi_k$ [25]. As such, the production of tensor mode h_k in inflationary cosmology can be computed from the quantum fluctuation of ψ_k during inflation and its consequent evolution. The result for an exponential inflation is a scale-invariant spectrum with amplitude $\sqrt{G_N \bar{H}}$ [26]. This analysis could be directly applicable here only if we replace G_N by G . Hence, when a tensor mode re-enters the horizon during the MD era, G equals to G_N and the mode amplitude is

$$h_k|_{\text{hor}} \sim G_N^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{H}. \quad (25)$$

Here the novelty is that the scalar and tensor perturbations depend respectively on two unrelated parameters, λ and $\bar{H}$. Thus, they would independently induce temperature fluctuations in the cosmic microwave background (CMB). From the recent *COBE* measurement of the CMB large-scale anisotropy, $\Delta T/T \sim 10^{-5}$ [27], Eqs. (24) and (25) imply that

$$\lambda \lesssim 10^{-2} \sqrt{c}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{H}/M_P \lesssim 10^{-5}, \quad (26)$$

where c is a logarithmically dependent factor. While almost all inflation models have negligible tensor contribution for a scale-invariant spectrum [28], the tensor mode produced here can easily dominate the scalar mode by suitably tuning λ and $\bar{H}$. In particular, it was recently pointed out that the CMB large-scale anisotropy could be due in part to the tensor perturbation [29].

In conclusion, we have attempted to include the scale-invariance as a fundamental symmetry of space-time. This results in a new scalar-tensor theory of gravitation. It can be realized as a Brans-Dicke model with a negative BD parameter. Our model has a very interesting cosmology. Firstly, it naturally incorporates a modified Hawking-Moss homogeneous inflation in which the Hubble expansion parameter is not fixed by the vacuum energy. While the interpretation of the HM solution is not without arbitrariness, we proceeded to estimate the metric perturbations produced during the HM inflation. We have found that both the scalar and tensor perturbations

have scale-invariant spectra but their amplitudes are independent of each other. In light of this, the CMB large-scale anisotropy might be mainly induced by the tensor mode. Secondly, if both the time variation of the gravitational constant and the non-vanishing of the cosmological constant are ascribed to a single theory of gravitation, our model would suggest that they are in fact exceedingly small after inflation. Here we have provided neither a detailed picture of how the universe changes from one phase to another, nor a systematic method of calculating the metric perturbations generated during the HM inflation. The work about these is in progress.

We would like to thank H. T. Cho, H.-C. Kao, W. F. Kao, and S.-Y. Wang for their useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Science Council, ROC under the Grants NSC86-2112-M-001-009 and NSC87-2112-M-001-039.

* E-mail address: sylin@iop.nctu.edu.tw

† E-mail address: nkw@phys.sinica.edu.tw

- [1] See, e.g., S. M. Christensen, *Quantum Theory of Gravity* (Adam Hilger, Bristol, 1984).
- [2] See, e.g., K. A. Olive, Phys. Reports **190**, 307 (1990).
- [3] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **124**, 925 (1961).
- [4] L. Smolin, Nucl. Phys. **B160**, 253 (1979); A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 417 (1979); F. S. Accetta, D. J. Zoller and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **31**, 3046 (1985).
- [5] D. La and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 376 (1989); Phys. Lett. **220B**, 375 (1989).
- [6] F. S. Accetta and J. J. Trester, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 2854 (1989); P. J. Steinhardt and F. S. Accetta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2740 (1990); J. Garcia-Bellido and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. **243B**, 45 (1990); R. Holman, E. W. Kolb, and Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 17 (1990).
- [7] H. Weyl, *Space-Time-Matter* (Dover, New York, 1922).
- [8] S. Deser, Ann. Phys. **59**, 248 (1970); K.-W. Ng, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **6**, 479 (1991).
- [9] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. R. Soc. London A **333**, 403 (1973); P. G. O. Freund, Ann. Phys. **84**, 440 (1974).
- [10] See, e.g., L. F. Abbott, Nucl. Phys. **B185**, 189 (1981).
- [11] S. R. Huggins, G. Kunstatter, H. P. Levio, and D. J. Toms, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 296 (1987); Nucl. Phys. **B301**, 627 (1988); H. T. Cho, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 3302 (1989).
- [12] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 1888 (1973).
- [13] We have also used the gauge-choice independent Vilkovisky-DeWitt method [14,11] to calculate the effective potential. The obtained value for κ is only slightly different from $3/2$ [15].
- [14] G. A. Vilkovisky, in Ref. [1]; Nucl. Phys. **B234**, 125 (1984); B. S. DeWitt, in *Architecture of Fundamental Interactions at Short Distances*, edited by P. Ramond and R. Stora (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987).
- [15] S.-Y. Lin and K.-W. Ng, unpublished.
- [16] S. W. Hawking and I. G. Moss, Phys. Lett. **110B**, 35 (1982).
- [17] E. Mottola and A. Lapedes, Phys. Rev. D **27**, 2285 (1983).
- [18] L. G. Jensen and P. J. Steinhardt, Nucl. Phys. **B237**, 176 (1984); A. Albrecht, L. G. Jensen, and P. J. Steinhardt, Nucl. Phys. **B239**, 290 (1984).
- [19] N. Deruelle, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **4**, 1297 (1989).
- [20] A. D. Linde, *Particle Physics and Inflationary Cosmology*, Chapter 7 (Harwood, Switzerland, 1990).
- [21] S. W. Hawking and I. G. Moss, Nucl. Phys. **B224**, 180 (1983).
- [22] J. M. Bardeen, P. J. Steinhardt, and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 679 (1983).
- [23] E. Mottola, Phys. Rev. D **27**, 2285 (1983).
- [24] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*, Chapter 3 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).
- [25] L. P. Grishchuk, Sov. Phys. JETP **40**, 409 (1975).
- [26] V. A. Rubakov, M. V. Sazhin, and A. V. Veryaskin, Phys. Lett. **115B**, 189 (1982); A. A. Starobinsky, Sov. Astron. Lett. **9**, 302 (1983); R. Fabbri and M. D. Pollock, Phys. Lett. **125B**, 445 (1983); L. F. Abbott and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B244**, 541 (1984).
- [27] G. F. Smoot *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **396**, L1 (1992).
- [28] See, e.g., P. J. Steinhardt, in *Particle and Nuclear Astrophysics and Cosmology in the Next Millennium*, edited by E. W. Kolb and R. D. Peccei (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995).
- [29] L. Krauss and M. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 869 (1992); R. L. Davis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1856 (1992); D. Salopek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3602 (1992); F. Lucchin, S. Matarrese, and S. Mollerach, Astrophys. J. **401**, L49 (1992); A. Liddle and D. Lyth, Phys. Lett. **291B**, 391 (1992); V. Sahni and T. Souradeep, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **7**, 3541 (1992); J. E. Lidsey and P. Coles, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **258**, 57P (1992).